SENATOR NEWELL: So no employee could, in fact, get more than the $6\frac{1}{2}$?

SENATOR KOCH: I will let that to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I can't answer that.

SENATOR NEWELL: Senator Warner, can you answer that question for me? Does this guarantee that no employee will get more than 6½%? Could Senator Warner's mike be turned on.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you. The bill as it was originally drafted, Senator Newell, and how it would read, if Senator Koch's amendment does permit up to a maximum, not to exceed a maximum of 10% for any given employee and that language I believe is in there with or without the Maxev amendment so that isn't affected and, of course, the funds that could do that....

SENATOR NEWELL: I missed what you said, Senator Warner. Could you do that one more time for me?

SENATOR WARNER: See, I don't believe that the Maxev amendment struck that limitation of not to exceed 10% to an individual employee. The funds, of course, could come from a variety of places. Not only the 24% but such things as vacancy savings, this type of thing, which we are constantly reminded that on the whole, at least, the full amount that is appropriated for salaries is not utilized for salaries and so there would be funds over and above the 6½%, at least in the larger agencies where vacancies occur for adjustments over and above that.

SENATOR NEWELL: Is there any guarantee that, then, Senator Warner, the only guarantee is that everybody will get the 4% but then it is totally discretionary for the rest of it all the way up to 10%? So in fact, some people could get a 4%. Some get a 10% raise. Very little uniformity and it is totally discretionary as to the department head, is that correct? Is that a correct understanding?

SENATOR WARNER: I don't think I would use those words, Senator Newell. I would say that a department head has the responsibility as well as the authority and what we pay for department heads they ought to assume the responsibility. In those instances where there would not be acceptable performance by an employee, why they would not get probably more than the 4%. Those visits I have had with agency heads have indicated they expect to give 6½° virtually to everyone.

SENATOR NEWELL: I have a dime here and I need to work on the last part of it. Basically, I oppose the Koch amendment which is basically the Warner amendment and the reason I oppose it is simply this. The question of discretion is a very grave problem when it has been given in the past. The history of this whole wage experience throughout the state, and I am somewhat familiar with this whole experience, has been that there is a great deal of, let's say, camaraderie and that the money tends to be channeled to the upper echelons of the department and so forth. In departments such as the Department of Roads, where large departments or large number of employees, then it is for local supervisors to be determined what the discretionary